

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,858	02/20/2004	Morihiro Okamoto	040069	1643
23850 7590 08/13/2007 KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP			EXAMINER	
1420 K Street,		•	PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M	
Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2627	
		•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/781,858	OKAMOTO, MORIHIRO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Aristotelis M. Psitos	2627				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply bound will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS futte, cause the application to become ABANDO	ION. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10	June 2007.					
<u> </u>	<u> </u>					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the applicati	on.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4-8,10,12,14,15,17-19,21,22,24 and 25</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,9,11,13,16,20 and 23</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ a	ccepted or b) objected to by the	ne Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to t						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr						
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached Off	fice Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).				
 Certified copies of the priority docume 						
2. Certified copies of the priority docume						
 Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bure 		eived in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l		eived.				
See the attached detailed Office detion for a f	iot of the continue copies her reco					
Attachment(s)	" 	(070,440)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma	nary (PTO-413) iil Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response of 6/10/07 has been considered with the following results.

Specification

The amended title of the invention is not descriptive. There is no correction capability in the claimed invention. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

Applicant is advised that should claim 20 be found allowable, claim 23 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

The examiner interprets both claims as being properly written to overcome any 101 "non-descriptive" subject matter problems – see MPEP 2106.1, sections I and II.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As amended, claim 1 already includes the subject matter of claim 9. It is therefore not clear what additional limitation this claim is attempting to define. Further response is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Application/Control Number: 10/781,858

Art Unit: 2627

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it is drawn to a program per see and hence is non statutory – Applicants attention is drawn to the available "interim guidelines" with respect to 101 statutory subject matter see MPEP section 2106.01 section II.

The following analysis is made.

Claim 13 although written in proper format (process/method) it is seeking protection of the processing program in the abstract as evidenced by claim 20. It neither has a practical application by any physical transformation, nor does it produce any useful and tangible result (as presented).

Claim 23 is interpreted as a METHOD CLAIM, i.e., although the claim recites in the first line a "record medium", the remainder of the preamble and the remaining limitations of the claim lead the examiner to conclude that the claim is indeed a METHOD.

As a method it is also attempting to seek patent protect of the processing program in the abstract as evidenced by claim 20. Similarly it fails to have any practical application by any physical transformation, nor does it produce any useful and tangible result.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/10/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The above noted claims fail for the reasons stated above, i.e., claim 13 and 23 fail to properly define statutory subject matter.

As far as the claims recite positive statutory limitations, the following rejections are made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/781,858

Art Unit: 2627

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-3,9,11,13,16,20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by JP 2004-039008.

With respect to claim 1; this claim recites a processing apparatus – which is interpreted as a CPU (computer) inherently having the appropriately claimed "information acquiring unit", "recording-information acquiring unit", information determining unit", and the "information selecting unit". That is the computer/cpu has the capability/appropriate internal "units" operable so as to be the above claimed "units".

The ultim ate paragraph in claim 1 describes the function of this "unit", such is found in the description of the submitted MAT (machine assisted translation) of JP 2004-039008 starting at paragraph 41. Hardware elements are described starting in paragraph 28.

The limitations of claims 2-3 are also found in the MAT thereof, starting at paragraphs 5-23, see also paragraphs 28-40.

With respect to claim 9, since the system can note/distinguish between a single and multimode session, this limitation is inherently present.

With respect to claim 11 see again the MAT starting at paragraph 45.

Claim 13 is the method analogous to the above apparatus of claim 1 and is met when the above system operates.

With respect to claim 16, the overall system of the JP document is interpreted as a "player" in that it can play cds. Hence it also must have an output unit, i.e., speakers.

Claims 20 & 23 are interpreted as duplicative, and since the above system operates in response to a set of instructions, these limitations are met.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/10/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The claims do not distinguish over the above noted art. There is no prohibition against the system performing the toc comparisons for a "type". In fact as interpreted/further identified in claim 1, whether a single or multi-session is present is indicative of "type of information".

3. Claims 1-3,9,11,13,16,20 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either the "Cactus Data Shield 200" article, or the "Feurio Versions-History: Version 1.64" article submitted by applicant in the IDS of 7/21/04 or alternatively under 35 USC 103 as being obvious thereover.

As cited therein, the Catcus article at pages 7-8 discloses the function described in the ultimate paragraph of claim 1. The remaining "units" recited in the claim are inherently present in the overall system described by this article.

Similarly, the description of the Feurio system – cd-manager as recited on page 1 of the document also meets the above claimed limitation.

With respect to the remaining "units" claimed, since the system is to be used in a playback device, such "units" must be present – i.e., or no playback would be possible.

With respect to dependent claims 2,3,9 & 11 such limitations are inherently present.

With respect to claim 16, the overall system of these documents are interpreted as a "player" in that they can play cds. Hence it also must have an output unit, i.e., speakers.

Claims 20 & 23 are interpreted as duplicative, and since the above system operates in response to a set of instructions, these limitations are met.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/10/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Since, no specific argument against the above noted reference(s) have been presented, no further rebuttal is necessary.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hahn ('730) cited as illustrative of prior art systems in this environment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M. Psitos whose telephone number is (571) 272-7594. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thursday: 6:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne D. Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/781,858

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aristotelis M Psito Primary Examiner Art Unit 2627

AMP